

Friends of Patterson Park was formed to revitalize the Park, restore the boat lake and the Pagoda, which serves as the centerpiece for summer concerts, and build a new playground for the growing number of children who live in the community. In 2002, the Patterson Park Charter School was formed by residents to entice young families to stay in the neighborhood.

I urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting the accomplishments of the PPCDC and its partners and in commending them for their work in East Baltimore. Their efforts to revitalize Patterson Park have become a model for other communities around the Nation.

PROTECTING OUR NATION FROM TERRORISM

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to confront a question of central importance to our Nation: are we doing everything we should to protect our Nation from terrorism?

This is not a threat we can afford to underestimate. The terrorists' means of organization, communication, and attack challenge our intelligence community, our armed forces, and our domestic law enforcement agencies in fundamentally new ways.

We must take the fight to the terrorists, but that does not mean we must sacrifice our moral leadership in the international community. We must defend our homeland from attacks, but we must also avoid self-inflicted damage to the values we stand for and the liberties of our people. Our strategy cannot be merely aggressive; it must also be smart and efficient, and it must be true to the values that make us American.

We must not only kill and capture specific terrorists and dismantle their organizations. We must also reduce the number of new terrorists and organizations that might exist tomorrow. Ultimately, we will win this war not by denying the rights of detainees and not by law enforcement excesses, but by protecting the integrity of our free and democratic society, and by repairing our diplomacy and showing the world that there is a better way.

The Bush Administration has repeatedly implied that Americans must be prepared to set aside moral considerations, American values, and America's image in the world if such concerns get in the way of the aggressive pursuit of terrorists. In reality, such a strategic blindness will hamper our ability to win the war on terrorism. An anti-terrorism strategy informed by moral considerations, American values, and our effort to lead the world by example is consistent with an anti-terrorism strategy that pursues terrorists smartly, effectively, and aggressively. What's more, such a strategy augments our efforts because it unites the American people—and the world—behind us.

Following the 9–11 attacks, President Bush had two choices. The first option was to create and implement a smart, bipartisan anti-terrorist strategy. Such a strategy would have been focused on devoting sufficient troops and resources to Afghanistan to bring down the

Taliban, find and incapacitate Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants, and enable that nation's successful reconstruction—not just in the capital but in the outlying areas that we have never fully secured.

The President could have capitalized on the tremendous outpouring of public support in the wake of the attacks to build bridges between our nation and the rest of the world, including the millions of moderate Muslims who hold no sympathy for the terrorists who are hijacking their religion. He would have proactively sought a resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which has historically been the largest source of inspiration for new generations of terrorists. (The Iraq war can now lay claim to that ignoble reputation.) And he would have more significantly bolstered our defense and intelligence assets to prevent future attacks and dismantle terrorist networks.

Instead, the President chose a second option that has simply failed to meet the standard of an intelligent anti-terrorism strategy. He diverted resources from the hunt for bin Laden to prepare for and initiate a war of choice in Iraq—a war, incidentally, that has made the threat of terrorism worse, not better. The recent National Intelligence Estimate makes this quite clear.

In doing so, President Bush left Afghanistan vulnerable to the resurgence of the Taliban we have seen over the last several months, resulting in a deteriorating security environment in that country five years after we supposedly defeated them. He has undertaken policies that have seriously undermined public support for the U.S. in the Islamic world and beyond, including policies that cultivated a culture within the military and the intelligence community that have tolerated and even encouraged the abuse of detainees—many of whom were later determined to be innocent bystanders. He has largely neglected the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with disastrous results for Israel, Lebanon, and the entire Middle East region.

David Schanzer, one of my constituents and director of the Triangle Center on Terrorism, got it right in a recent op-ed. He wrote: "Unfortunately, we have made no progress, and in fact may have lost ground, in the ideological conflict that is fueling jihadist violence around the globe."

So I ask today: are we doing everything we should to protect our nation against another terrorist attack? Is President Bush pursuing a smart, effective strategy to win the war on terrorism? The answer to these questions is clearly "no."

This week in the House, we are debating two prominent components of the President's strategy to fight terrorism: a bill to grant the President the right to circumvent checks by the judiciary to wiretap the phones of American citizens, and a bill to establish an extrajudiciary system for trying detained terrorist suspects. These bills are both clear examples of how the President continues to make the wrong choices in the war on terrorism.

There is no doubt that we need a more extensive and sophisticated wiretapping program directed at those who mean us harm, both outside and inside the United States. That is not the question. The question is who should make decisions that balance civil liberties with surveillance needs. The Administration says "just trust us." To that, we say a resounding no. This is not merely because the Attorney

General and the Bush administration have proved unreliable stewards of our liberties. It also recognizes what our founding fathers knew quite well, that balancing power among institutions with different functional roles is the essential to our form of government. The executive branch is in the business of putting criminals and terrorists in jail; the judicial branch is in the business of interpreting the law and the Constitution, and protecting individual rights. Neither can effectively do the job of the other.

The 1978 FISA law established procedures governing how the Federal Government can constitutionally collect foreign intelligence, including the ability to gather intelligence immediately in urgent situations and to obtain a warrant post-facto. Unfortunately, this administration feels that protecting the constitutional rights of its citizens has become too cumbersome. Instead of abiding by current law, the administration has chosen to make up new ones. And now that we have called the administration on this violation of the law, it is asking Congress to formally authorize its practices. In essence, the administration is telling us that we have to choose between being safe and being free. I, for one, am not willing to accept this overly simple analysis or the proposed wiretapping bill.

We do not yet know what provisions will be included in the House bill, but the President's proposal would allow warrantless surveillance of international calls and e-mails of American citizens without any evidence that they are conspiring with terrorist organizations. The communications of Americans would only be protected if the National Security Administration "reasonably believes" all senders and recipients are in the U.S. Essentially this provision would allow anybody communicating with family or friends outside the U.S. to be monitored at any given time without any real justification or oversight.

In addition, the President's proposal would pre-approve warrantless searches on all Americans following a terrorist attack in the United States for up to 45 days. I know the investigations that take place in the days and weeks following a terrorist attack are crucial in apprehending all of those involved, and I agree that we need to make sure the intelligence community has whatever resources it needs. However, providing pre-approval to the President to violate the 4th amendment of the Constitution after an attack is completely unnecessary. Current law already allows the President reasonable exemptions in these situations, and if extensions are needed, he simply needs to request judicial approval.

The second key terrorism bill under debate in the House this week would establish a system for bringing detained terrorist suspects to trial. Again, there is wide and bipartisan agreement that this issue must be addressed. But President Bush has once again failed to choose the smart and morally acceptable way to do it.

Over the past 3 years, many of us have watched in horror as new details about the Bush administration's treatment of detainees have been revealed. Torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, indefinite imprisonment—Americans used to think of these as charges off the pages of reports about other countries, not as sanctioned American policies. While some of us have spoken out against these practices since they became public, recent actions by

the Supreme Court and a handful of courageous Senators have forced the administration to revisit them. Yet, the legislation before the House—legislation supported by Republicans in the House, Senate, and White House—would do little to rein them in.

In fact, under the proposed legislation, the Administration could continue to arbitrarily arrest and detain foreign citizens. It could continue to imprison these detainees indefinitely, without standard judicial protections such as their right to challenge their detention in court and the right of the accused to know the charges against them. And, despite the coverage granted to the so-called compromise between the White House and Senate Republicans, the Administration would still be able to continue practices that violate the Geneva Conventions prohibition of torture.

Many have argued that we must prioritize winning the war on terrorism above considerations for the rights of detainees accused of having links to terrorism, as if the two were always mutually exclusive. It might be tempting to understand the issue in such simple terms, but we should resist that temptation.

It is certainly true that terrorism is such a grave threat to our nation that, in some circumstances, extraordinary actions may be necessary to protect American lives. The question we should be asking, however, is whether particular policies advance our fight against terrorism, both now and over the long term. In this case, the moral argument—that potentially innocent detainees do have rights that should be protected—is in line with the appropriate strategic argument.

In the short-term, the Administration's approach fails because, as current and former military and intelligence officers have repeatedly stated, torture does not reliably produce actionable intelligence. In addition to the statements of these experts, we have hard evidence: the New York Times has reported that, according to our military, interrogators were able to obtain up to *50 percent more* actionable intelligence from detainees at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq *after* coercive practices like hooding, stripping, and sleep deprivation were banned.

In the long-term, the Bush administration's approach is even more detrimental to our progress in the war on terrorism. First, it is already having disastrous repercussions on our effort to win the hearts and minds of those at risk of being tempted by terrorist recruiters. Let us be clear: while stopping active terrorists is a critical challenge, disrupting the development of new generations of terrorists is the single most important task in winning the war on terrorism. Every person that we can persuade to renounce violence and cast his or her lot with the forces of moderation is one fewer threat to our Nation, one fewer potential airplane hijacker or train bomber.

Winning hearts and minds is no exercise in sentimentality; it is perhaps the key strategy in protecting our Nation from another 9–11. The Administration's approach negates such efforts, as it essentially endorses indefinite imprisonment, arbitrary detention, and treatment of detainees in violation of the Geneva Conventions.

The Administration's approach further harms our progress in the war on terrorism by placing our own troops at risk. It sends a dangerous signal to other nations that the United States has endorsed these practices for for-

eign detainees, inviting these nations to visit the same practices upon our own troops. It is that risk that has led several top-ranking former military leaders to object to the Administration's proposal.

There is no question that a system is needed for bringing terrorists to justice. But doing it the wrong way will impede our ability to stop terrorists in the future. And the Bush administration's approach is, quite clearly, the wrong way. Victory in the war on terrorism demands, and the American people deserve, a smarter approach, consistent with the values that have made our country great.

Mr. Speaker, we can choose a smart, effective strategy for combating terrorism that makes our Nation safer, or we can opt for an irresponsible, shortsighted approach that undermines our progress. These bills represent the latter. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose them.

COMMENDING THE MAGIC SCHOOL BUS ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. VERNON J. EHLERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and recognize The Magic School Bus on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

As many of my colleagues know, The Magic School Bus is a unique series of books, television programs and teaching materials for children that encourage a love of science and inspire positive attitudes toward math and science education.

What my colleagues may not know is that with 131 book titles and more than 58 million books in print, The Magic School Bus is one of the most successful children's science series, and it continues to grow in popularity every day. This series has earned numerous prestigious national recognition awards.

I am proud to support The Magic School Bus and its partnership with the National Science Foundation in a television series and museum exhibit, and I commend the Magic School Bus for its tireless efforts.

Congratulations to The Magic School Bus on this occasion of its 20th anniversary. May these efforts continue to spark the curiosity of millions of children and help motivate children to further pursue their interests in math and science.

CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM NUSSLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Child Custody Protection Act (S. 403). This important legislation protects our children by imposing stiff penalties on adults who evade State parental consent laws to transport a minor across State lines for the sole purpose of having an abortion.

I believe we must protect our children from being exploited or coerced into having an

abortion and reaffirm the rights of parents to be involved in the important decisions of their lives. We currently require parental consent forms for field trips, sports and other activities. It's only common-sense that these important laws are not circumvented for the purpose of performing an abortion.

With over 50 percent of States having parental consent laws on the books, I believe it is imperative the Child Custody Protection Act become law to protect those who may not be able to protect themselves from harm as well as to ensure that these important state laws are respected.

RECOGNIZING THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF TRINITY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Trinity Baptist Church of Asheville, North Carolina. On October 1, 2006 Trinity Baptist will celebrate 40 years of service to the people of Western North Carolina, and I commend them for the leadership and tireless work they have contributed to the Asheville community.

With 60 members under the direction of Rev. Ralph Sexton, Sr. as the Pastor and Dr. James A. Stewart as the Honorary Pastor, a building for Trinity Baptist Church founded upon the scripture from Psalm 127:1, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

For 13 years, Dr. Ralph Sexton, Jr. served as staff evangelist and youth pastor under his father. On the first Sunday of April 1988, upon his father's resignation as senior pastor, Dr. Ralph Sexton, Jr. became the senior pastor of Trinity Baptist Church. As the church continued to grow, mission outreach was increased both at home and abroad.

To meet the needs of the growing congregation, several buildings have been erected. The Family Life Center was built in 1984 housing office space, a kitchen, fellowship room and gymnasium, to provide a space for fun, food and fellowship for the whole family. In 1992 a Baby Palace was added to meet the need of the growing families of the church.

A Bible Institute program was started in 1989 for those who wish to devote their lives to the ministry of learning to serve; this became a 4-year Bible College in 1993. Most recently the church built a 1,500-seat sanctuary which has been named the "Tabernacle of the Mountains" in honor of the life and ministry of Dr. Ralph Sexton, Sr., who served the congregation for 22 years.

In 1991, Trinity Baptist Church opened their doors to Russian immigrants many of whom came to this country because of religious persecution. Trinity Baptist Church accommodated the immigrants by providing services in their native languages, in addition to sponsoring many of the immigrants.

In 1994, the EEOC threatened religious freedom by prohibiting any expression of religious faith in the workplace. Trinity Baptist Church worked with me and other area churches to preclude these improper regulations. Pastor Sexton and members of Trinity